

FORM 32. Response to Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts

Form 32
March 2023

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

RESPONSE TO NOTICE TO ADVISE OF SCHEDULING CONFLICTS

Case Number: 22-2288Short Case Caption: Apple Inc. v. Corephotonics, Ltd.Party Name(s): Apple Inc.

INFORMATION: The court uses this form to determine whether and when to schedule cases for oral argument. Arguing counsel may be changed later, but a motion to reschedule is required once the court schedules argument. Please plan in advance to adhere to the limit on the number of arguing counsel in Fed. Cir. R. 34(e).

Argument Waiver ☐ My party intends to waive oral argument.

NOTE: Filers checking this box must still complete the below sections. **The court may still schedule this case for oral argument even if any party intends to waive argument.** If scheduled, parties may still elect to waive argument using the response to notice of oral argument form.

Other Parties Representing Interests

☐ Counsel for another party will represent my party's interests at oral argument

NOTE: If this box is checked, skip the remaining sections. Any argument date will be selected based on conflict dates for counsel arguing on behalf of your party.

Name of Expected Arguing Counsel	Debra J. McComas
---	------------------

Dates Unavailable

Do you have dates of unavailability within the specific sessions identified by the court's Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts in your case?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, attach a separate sheet listing **up to ten dates** of unavailability and **include a statement showing good cause for each date.** Dates without good cause or that do not pertain to arguing counsel (e.g., client conflicts) will not be accepted. The court will only accept dates for one counsel and only if that counsel has filed an entry of appearance. The Clerk's Office will evaluate and note accepted or rejected conflict dates; counsel may contact the Clerk's Office about re-filing if dates are rejected. *See* Fed. Cir. R. 34(d); Practice Notes to Rule 34.

FORM 32. Response to Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts

Form 32
March 2023

Potential Case Conflicts

Are there other pending cases before this court (regardless of case status) in which expected arguing counsel in this case also expects to argue?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, attach a separate sheet listing those cases.

I certify the above information and any attached statement is complete and accurate. I further certify that I will update my notice should new conflicts arise or existing conflicts change.

Date: 08/17/2023

Signature: /s/ Debra J. McComas

Name: Debra J. McComas

NO. 22-2288

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT**

APPLE INC.,
Appellant

v.

COREPHOTONICS, LTD.,
Appellee

**On Appeal from the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in
Inter Partes Review No. IPR2020-00489**

**STATEMENT OF GOOD CAUSE FOR SCHEDULING CONFLICTS
PURSUANT TO FED. CIR. R. 34(d)(3)**

I am counsel of record for Appellant Apple Inc., and I expect to present oral argument in this matter.

I have three dates of unavailability within the six months of potential argument dates in this matter: December 4, 2023; December 5, 2023; and December 6, 2023. I will be on a pre-paid and non-refundable vacation on December 4 and 5 with return travel that will make me unavailable for argument on December 6.

I respectfully request that the Court not schedule oral argument in this case during these dates.

Dated: August 17, 2023

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Debra J. McComas

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP

Debra J. McComas

2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700

Dallas, Texas 75219

Phone: (214) 651-5533

Debbie.McComas@haynesboone.com

Attorney for Appellant, Apple Inc.

NO. 22-2288

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT**

APPLE INC.,
Appellant

v.

COREPHOTONICS, LTD.,
Appellee

**On Appeal from the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in
Inter Partes Review No. IPR2020-00489**

POTENTIAL OTHER CONFLICTS IN PENDING CASES

- *Nabors Drilling Technologies USA, Inc. v. Helemerich & Payne International Drilling Co.*, No. 23-1261
- *B.E. Technology v. Twitter, Inc.*, No. 23-1126
- *Carucel Investments L.P. v. Unified Patents, LLC*, No. 21-1731
- *DivX, LLC v. Unified Patents, LLC*, No. 23-1699
- *Gesture Technology Partners, LLC v. Unified Patents, LLC*, No. 23-1444
- *Acufloor, LLC v. EvenTile, Inc.*, No. 23-1887
- *Xerox Corp. v. X Corp.*, No. 23-1913
- *Xerox Corp. v. X Corp.*, No. 23-1968
- *Xerox Corp. v. Snap Inc.*, No. 23-1983
- *Dolby Laboratories Licensing Corporation v. Unified Patents, LLC*, No. 23-2110